

**Burns, Vanessa**

---

**From:** Ray Elling [r-elling58@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 25, 2011 11:53 AM  
**To:** mullinar@att.net; AppropriationTestimony  
**Cc:** Ruth Grobe; Beth Bye; james.mcgaughey@po.state.ct.us  
**Subject:** RE: Testimony in opposition to proposed cuts to the 2010-11 P&A budget.  
 Keith, good job. Hope it gets formally noticed and has the desired effect.

Best,  
 Ray

---

**From:** mullinar@att.net  
**To:** appropriationtestimo@cga.ct.gov  
**CC:** r-elling58@hotmail.com; RRGrobe@aol.com; Bethbye@aol.com; james.mcgaughey@po.state.ct.us  
**Subject:** Testimony in opposition to proposed cuts to the 2010-11 P&A budget.  
**Date:** Fri, 25 Feb 2011 11:41:20 -0500

Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony concerning budget cuts to the Office of Protection and Advocacy.

I suspect that the majority of testimony that you have heard is a direct plea from the disabled community who are genuinely concerned over the recommended reductions to the P&A budget. As a member of the disabled population I wholeheartedly agree, pointing out that many concerns faced by the disabled population are not properly addressed particularly when considering many of these people are inadequately equipped to advocate for themselves. Making significant cuts to the budget of a small agency that supports such a vulnerable population seems less than appropriate.

Realizing the difficulties involved with identifying and implementing the massive budget cuts needed to reduce the current deficit to an acceptable level, It is interesting to look at some gross numbers when considering the proposed reductions in staff and funding for an agency as small and valuable as P&A. which serves a potential consumer base of 700,000. (Based on a CT population of something over 3.5M where 20% is classified as disabled.)

As budgeting is an exercise in number manipulation, I have extrapolated the following from the projected 2011-12 budget which seems to reflect an object lesson in insensitivity toward the disabled community. (Worksheet attached.)

**P & A (700,000 potential consumers):**

Fulltime Permanent Positions (FPP):

Requested:	33	Consumers/FPP:	21,212
Recommended:	29	Consumers /FPP	24,138

(A 14% increase in workload in addition to the net 8 positions eliminated in recent years.)  
 (Making a gross assumption where 1 in 10 consumers potentially require the services of P&A, this still results in a potential ratio of 2,414 consumers per P&A FPP.)

Total – all funds net per P&A consumer (.7M):

Requested:	\$6.45
Recommended:	\$5.89

Total – all funds net per citizen (3.5M)

Requested:	\$1.29
Recommended:	\$1.18

The recommended reduction in expenses of \$40,000 saves the average citizen a fraction over \$.01 for the year!

2/25/2011

Compare the above to:

### **Department of Transportation (3.5M consumers)**

Fulltime Permanent Positions (FPP):

Requested:	3,293	Consumers per FPP	1,062
Recommended:	3,297	Consumers per FPP	1,063

Total – all funds net per citizen (3.5M)

Requested:	\$182.41
Recommended:	\$172.01

### **Judicial (3.5M consumers)**

Fulltime Permanent Positions (FPP):

Requested:	4,201	Consumers per FPP	833
Recommended:	4,201	Consumers per FPP	833

Total – all funds net per citizen (3.5M)

Requested:	\$148.38
Recommended:	\$148.38

I leave you to draw your own conclusions when comparing 1) workload per Fulltime Permanent Position and 2) the cost per consumer.

Thank you for your attention.

Keith Mullinar  
967 Elms Common Drive – 104  
Rocky Hill, CT 06067  
860-297-1296